



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,369	05/08/2001	Julie F. Lyman	7784-000185	2389
27572	7590	06/05/2006		EXAMINER
		HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.		TRAN, HAI V
		P.O. BOX 828		ART UNIT
		BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303		PAPER NUMBER
				2623

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/851,369	LYMAN, JULIE F.	
	Examiner Hai Tran	Art Unit 2623	
<p><b>--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</b></p>			
<p>THE REPLY FILED <u>08 May 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.</p>			
<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p>			
<p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p>			
<p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p>			
<p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>			
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>			
<p><b>NOTICE OF APPEAL</b></p>			
<p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>      </u>. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p>			
<p><b>AMENDMENTS</b></p>			
<p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p>			
<p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p>			
<p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p>			
<p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p>			
<p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p>			
<p>NOTE: <u>      </u>. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p>			
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p>			
<p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): <u>      </u>.</p>			
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>      </u> would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>			
<p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p>			
<p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p>			
<p>Claim(s) allowed: <u>      </u>.</p>			
<p>Claim(s) objected to: <u>      </u>.</p>			
<p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u>.</p>			
<p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>      </u>.</p>			
<p><b>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</b></p>			
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p>			
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p>			
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p>			
<p><b>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</b></p>			
<p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></p>			
<p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). <u>      </u></p>			
<p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>      </u>.</p>			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claim 1, Applicant argues, "Sklar et al. does not describe bi-directional communication between the transmission stations (12,18) and the aircraft 34."

In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "bi-directional communication with a ground segment via satellite link" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Claim 12, Applicant further argues, "Sklar et al. does not describe bi-directional communication between the transmission stations 12,18 and the aircraft 34. furthermore, the regional control unit 44 apparently does not use data from the transmission station 12 or satellite 24 to configure the system receiver station 36 to receive programs in the coverage area 30."

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant because Sklar clearly discloses the use of Ku-Band to communicate between the satellite 24 and an area on earth through uplink/downlink stream including the moving receiver 34 (Col. 7, lines 32-45). Moreover, the tracking antenna of the aircraft 34 receives broadcast entertainment transmissions from a 1st transmitter, i.e., 12,24 having a 1st coverage area so the system receiver station 36 is able to track its location within the coverage area (Col. 4, lines 1-25).

Claim 15, Applicant argues, Sklar et al. Does not anticipate a "network operating center configured to coordinate multicasts of data content by said ground stations..."

In response, Sklar's Fig. 1 inherently includes NOC within the network that comprise signal source A and B (Col. 7, lines 12-45).

Claim 19, Applicant argues, "it would not all have been obvious to modify the system of Sklar et al., which does not provide communication via satellite from the aircraft to the transmission station (12,18), to format entertainment data content with encapsulated IP packets as taught by Nelson."

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant because Sklar clearly discloses that communication system of Sklar able to perform bi-directional uplink/downlink using Ku-Band (Col. 7, lines 32-45). In view of that it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sklar to format the selected data content with encapsulated IP packets so to provide Internet service to users, as suggested by Nelson (Col. 3, lines 30-60).



HATTRAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER